

REMARKS

This Reply to Office Action is responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 14, 2006. Claims 17-39, 44 and 46-48 are pending in the present Application. Applicants have canceled claim 48. Accordingly, claims 17-39, 44 and 46-47 are now at issue.

With this Reply, Applicants submit a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time, making Applicants' Reply due on or before August 14, 2006. Accordingly, Applicants' Reply is timely filed.

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 23-28, 31, 33-36 and 44 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Sanchez, et al.* (U.S. 6,086,415). The Examiner also rejected claims 17-20, 22-28, 30-37, 39, 44, 46 and 47 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curry, et al.* (U.S. 6,053,764) in view of *Arnett* (U.S. 5,238,926). The Examiner further rejected claims 21 and 38 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curry* in view of *Arnett*, and further in view of *Rutkowski, et al.* (U.S. 5,639,261). The Examiner also rejected claim 29 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curry* in view of *Arnett*, and further in view of *Gutierrez, et al.* (U.S. 6,585,540). The Examiner further rejected claim 48 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curry* in view of *Welch, et al.* (4,875,880). However, Applicants submit that claims 17-39, 44 and 46-47 are patentable over the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination.

As shown in FIG. 2, independent claim 17 requires a frame 22 having a top flange 30 and a bottom flange 34. Frame 22 includes a plurality of faceplate openings 38. As best seen in FIG. 12, faceplate 24 is mountable to the frame 22 within the top flange 30 and the bottom flange 34, and the faceplate 24 has a plurality of mounting openings 56, 58, 60, 62. Each mounting opening has at least one modular jack

retention latch 64 or 66 **protruding within the mounting opening** (see FIG. 6). Patch panel 20 also includes at least one modular jack 26 mountable into a rear side of the faceplate 24.

Applicants submit that *Sanchez* does not disclose a faceplate having a plurality of mounting openings and each mounting opening having at least one modular jack retention latch protruding within the mounting opening. As best seen in Fig. 3, *Sanchez* discloses a jack holder (22) mountable to a front panel (24), and the jack holder (22) has a plurality of mounting openings (32). However, each mounting opening (32) does not have at least one modular jack retention latch protruding within the mounting opening. In fact, mounting opening (32) does not have any structure protruding therein. The Examiner erroneously contends that mounting opening (32) has at least one modular jack retention latch (at 44) protruding within the mounting opening. As shown in Figs. 3 and 5 and as described in column 3, lines 29-31, upper engagement member (38) includes rearwardly extending projection (42) with an undercut portion (44). Undercut portion (44) is not part of jack holder (22), nor does undercut portion (44) protrude within mounting opening (32). Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 17 is patentable over *Sanchez*. Claims 18-39 are asserted to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 17.

For at least the reasons discussed above regarding independent claim 17, Applicants submit that independent method claim 44 is patentable over *Sanchez*. Claims 46 and 47 are asserted to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 44.

Applicants also submit that *Curry* and/or *Arnett*, taken alone or in combination, do

not disclose each mounting opening 56, 58, 60 or 62 having at least one modular jack retention latch 64 or 66 protruding within the mounting opening. As discussed in specification paragraph [0036], modular jack retention latches 64, 66 protrude within the mounting opening, such as mounting opening 56 (see FIG. 6), and allow the modular jacks, such as jack 26, to be mounted straight into the rear of the faceplate 24. Thus, the modular jack retention latches 64, 66 maximize the patch panel density because the straight-in insertion of the modular jacks minimizes the required distance between two vertically stacked modular jacks.

The Examiner contends that *Curry* discloses faceplate (14) having a plurality of mounting openings (at 16) and at least one modular jack retention latch (51, Fig. 4). The Examiner is correct in that *Curry* discloses front housing (14) having a plurality of apertures (16) and at least one latch hook (49 or 51, see Fig. 4). However, claim 17 requires a faceplate having a plurality of mounting openings and **each mounting opening having at least one modular jack retention latch protruding within the mounting opening**. *Curry* does not disclose apertures (16) having any modular jack retention latches, nor does *Curry* disclose any modular jack retention latches protruding within the mounting openings. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's contention, *Curry* does not disclose substantially the claimed invention except for a retention latch for each mounting opening.

The Examiner also contends that *Arnett* teaches a faceplate (30) having a mounting opening (16) and the mounting opening having at least one modular jack retention latch (59) to hold the connector secured to the faceplate. The Examiner is

correct in that *Arnett* discloses an adapter (30) having a single mounting opening (not numbered). However, claim 17 requires a faceplate having a **plurality** of mounting openings. *Arnett* does not disclose a faceplate having a plurality of mounting openings because adapter (30) is not a faceplate. Moreover, *Arnett* does not disclose adapter (30) having any modular jack retention latches. Even if inner wall surface (59) of groove (55) is construed to be a modular jack retention latch, which Applicants dispute, inner wall surface (59) of groove (55) certainly does not protrude within the mounting opening.

In fact, groove (55) does exactly the opposite, because groove (55) is recessed from the mounting opening. Further, it would not be obvious to modify adapter (30) to include a modular jack retention latch protruding within the mounting opening. In fact, if inner wall surface (59) of groove (55) protruded within the opening of adapter (30), connector (60) would be inoperable for its intended purpose. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claim 17 is patentable over *Curry* and/or *Arnett*, taken alone or in combination. Claims 18-39 are asserted to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 17.

For at least the reasons discussed above regarding independent claim 17, Applicants submit that independent method claim 44 is patentable over *Curry* and/or *Arnett*, taken alone or in combination. Claims 46 and 47 are asserted to be allowable based on their dependency from allowable claim 44.

Applicants have canceled independent claim 48, in order to move this case to allowance. However, Applicants do not concede that claim 48 is unpatentable over the cited prior art, and Applicants reserve the right to pursue claim 48 in continuations of this application.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 17-39, 44 and 46-47 are allowable and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher S. Clancy
Reg. No. 44,618
Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: August 14, 2006

Panduit Corp.
Legal Department - TP12
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1302